

## **REMARKS**

### **A. Summary of Examiner's Action**

In the subject office action, the Examiner objected to claim 1, and rejected under 35 USC 103

(a) claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 10-13, 18, 21 and 22, in view of USP 6,371,617 to Nishida and USP 6,318,863 to Tiao combined, and

(b) claims 3 and 23 in view of Nishida, Tiao and further in view of USP 5,159,485 to Nelson,

(c) claim 14 in view of Nishida, Tiao and further in view of USP 6,155,687 to Peterson,

(d) claims 15-17 and 19 in view of Nishida, Tiao and further in view of USP 5,658,060 to Dove, and

(e) claim 20 in view of Nishida, Tiao and further in view of USP 5,760,875 to Daijogo.

### **B. Summary of Response**

In response, Applicants have cancelled claim 11, amended claims 1 and 19-23, and added new claims 24-27.

Additionally, Applicants have also amended paragraphs 40 and 42 of the specification.

All amendments are fully supported by the original disclosure, no new matters have been introduced.

C. Rejections of claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 10-13, 18, 21 and 22 under 35 USC 103

Rejection of claim 11 has been rendered moot by its cancellation.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner asserted that except for the limitation of "coherent light source", all other limitations are taught by Nishida, and the deficiency of Nishida is remedied by Tiao. Further, one ordinarily skilled in the art would be motivated to combine the teachings of Nishida and Tiao.

In response, Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitation that the blue, green and red light from the coherent light source are provided to the micromirror display devices, "**avoiding the dichroic cross-combiner assembly**", i.e. without going through the dichroic cross-combiner assembly.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 is distinguishable over Nishida. Since Tiao does not remedy this deficiency of Nishida, amended claim is patentable over Nishida and Tiao combined.

Claim 21 has been similarly amended to include the same limitations as claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claim 21 is patentable over Nishida and Tiao.

Claims 4, 5, 8, 10-13, 18 and 22 depend on claims 1 and 21 respectively, incorporating their limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claims 4, 5, 8, 10-13, 18 and 22 are patentable over Nishida and Tiao combined.

D. Rejections of claims 3 and 23 under 35 USC 103

Claims 3 and 23 depend on claims 1 and 21 respectively, incorporating their limitations. Since Nelson also does not remedy the above discussed deficiency in teachings of Nishida, so for at least the same reasons, claims 3 and 23 are patentable over Nishida and Tiao, even when further combined with Nelson.

E. Rejection of claim 14 under 35 USC 103

Claim 14 depends on claim 1, incorporating its limitations. Since Peterson also does not remedy the above discussed deficiency in teachings of Nishida, so for at least the same reasons, claim 14 is patentable over Nishida and Tiao, even when further combined with Peterson.

F. Rejections of claims 15-17 and 19 under 35 USC 103

Claims 15-17 and 19 depend on claim 1, incorporating its limitations. Since Dove also does not remedy the above discussed deficiency in teachings of Nishida, so for at least the same reasons, claims 15-17 and 19 are patentable over Nishida and Tiao, even when further combined with Dove.

G. Rejection of claim 20 under 35 USC 103

Claim 20 depends on claim 1, incorporating its limitations. Since Daijogo also does not remedy the above discussed deficiency in teachings of Nishida, so for at least the same reasons, claim 20 is patentable over Nishida and Tiao, even when further combined with Daijogo.

H. New claims 24-27

Claim 24 recites in pertinent parts to require the micromirror display devices to be correspondingly disposed facing the **side outer surfaces** of the dichroic cross-combiner assembly, and the light source be disposed **at a location lower than a projection lens**, which is disposed facing another **side outer surface** of the dichroic cross-combiner assembly.

Nishida does not teach the recited configuration. If Figure 10 is a side/end view of the arrangement, at least two of the micromirror display devices are

correspondingly disposed facing the **top and bottom outer surfaces** of the prism assembly instead. If Figure 10 is a top/bottom view of the arrangement, then the light source and the projection lens are disposed in a **side-by-side** arrangement.

None of the other references remedy Nishida's deficiency in teachings.

Accordingly, new claim 24 is patentable over the cited references.

Claim 26 contains similar limitations as claim 24. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, new claim 24 is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 25 and 27 are dependent on claims 24 and 26 respectively, incorporating their limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reason, new claims 25 and 27 are patentable over the cited references.


#### I. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1, 3-5, 8-10, and 12-27, and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,  
Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C.

Date: June 6, 2003

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Aloysius AuYeung  
Reg. No. 35,432

Pacwest Center  
1211 SW Fifth Ave., Ste 1600-1900  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Phone: (503) 222-9981  
FAX: (503) 796-2900